

REMARKS

Claims 11-32 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-10 were previously withdrawn from consideration. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C 102

Claims 11-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mills et al., U.S. Patent No. 2004/0048503 A1, hereafter referred to as Miller. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Claim 11 recites (emphasis added):

A method for copying an application on a portable computer having a main memory and a removable memory, said method comprising:
 updating a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory;
 choosing an application of said main memory to copy;
 changing a category name of said application from a category associated with said main memory to said category associated with said removable memory; and
 in response thereto, automatically copying said application to said removable memory.

Independent Claims 17, 22 and 29 recite similar limitations as Independent Claim 11. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that Miller fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of the present invention. In

fact, Miller fails to teach or suggest any limitations of the present invention other than purporting to teach a removable memory.

Miller, page 2 paragraph [0016]-[0019] is cited as teaching "choosing a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest "choosing a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. Miller purports to teach an adapter for removable memory. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest category names associated with applications, removable memories or main memories, as claimed. Applicants request the Examiner to clearly cite where Miller teaches "choosing a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. Applicants assert that the cited passage of Miller fails to teach or suggest this limitation as claimed.

Miller page 3 paragraphs [0035]-[0038] is cited as teaching "choosing an application name of said application from a category associated with said main memory to said category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. Miller purports to teach a removable memory in combination with an external I/O connector for providing both I/O and memory functions in a single closed-case removable expansion card. This is very different from "choosing an application name of said

application from a category associated with said main memory to said category associated with said removable memory," as claimed.

Furthermore, Miller teaches "application specific expansion cards," which implies that the expansion card has a pre-determined application for upgrading the functionality of the device. With Miller, the expansion card comprises an application prior to use in the device. In contrast, the present invention automatically copies the application from the main memory of the device to the expansion card, as claimed.

Miller page 4, paragraphs [0045]-[0046] is cited as teaching "in response thereto, automatically copying said application to said removable memory," as claimed. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. Miller purports to teach a method of digitally encoded media playback. Once again, Miller teaches copying data from the expansion card to memory of the portable device, which teaches away from "automatically copying said application to said removable memory, as claimed."

Miller fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of the present invention. Miller fails to teach or suggest key concepts of the present invention such as a method of copying an application from a main memory to an expansion

card, as taught in independent Claim 11. Independent Claims 17, 22 and 29 recite similar limitations as Independent Claim 11.

For the same rational presented above in conjunction with independent Claim 11, Independent Claims 17, 22 and 29 are not anticipated by Miller. For example, Miller fails to teach or suggest an electronic device comprising a copy function implemented by said processor wherein an application is copied from said built-in memory to said expansion memory by changing an associated category name of said application, as claimed in independent Claim 17. For this rational, Claims 11-32 are not anticipated by Miller. As such, Claims 11-32 are in condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 11-32 is earnestly solicited.


CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 5/18, 2005



Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060